

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TEXARKANA DIVISION**

COLLIN HAYDEN,

Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:23-CV-33-RWS-JBB

ORDER

Before the Court is Movant Collin Hayden's motion to vacate or correct his federal sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. Docket No. 1. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Boone Baxter in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636.

On June 9, 2025, the Magistrate Judge issued a report recommending the motion be denied. Docket No. 9 at 12. The Magistrate Judge held Movant's claims for § 2255 relief are without merit. *Id.* at 5–11. According to the Magistrate Judge, Movant is not entitled to a certificate of appealability because Movant has not (1) made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right; (2) shown that reasonable jurists could debate whether his motion to vacate or correct sentence should have been resolved in a different manner; or (3) shown that the issues presented are adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further. *Id.* at 12.

A copy of the Report and Recommendation was sent to Movant at his last known address, but no objections have been received. The Fifth Circuit has explained that, where a letter is properly placed in the United States mail, a presumption exists that the letter reached its destination in the usual time and was actually received by the person to whom it was addressed. *Faciane v. Sun Life Assurance Co. of Can.*, 931 F.3d 412, 420–21 & n.9 (5th Cir. 2019). Because no objections have been received, Movant is barred from *de novo* review by the District Judge of the

Magistrate Judge’s proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendations. *See Duarte v. City of Lewisville*, 858 F.3d 348, 352 (5th Cir. 2017). Moreover, except upon grounds of plain error, an aggrieved party is barred from appellate review of the unobjected-to factual findings and legal conclusions accepted and adopted by the District Court. *See id.*; *Arriaga v. Laxminarayan*, No. 4:21-CV-00203-RAS, 2021 WL 3287683, at *1 (E.D. Tex. July 31, 2021).

The Court has reviewed the motion and the Government’s response in this case as well as the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. Upon such review, the Court has determined the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is correct. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (where no objections to a magistrate judge’s report are filed, the standard of review is “clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law”).

The Court also concludes that Movant is not entitled to a certificate of appealability. An appeal from a judgment denying post-conviction collateral relief may not proceed unless a judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253. The standard for a certificate of appealability requires the movant to make “a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483–84 (2000) (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)); *see also Elizalde v. Dretke*, 362 F.3d 323, 328 (5th Cir. 2004). To make a substantial showing, the movant need not establish that he would prevail on the merits. *See Slack*, 529 U.S. at 483–84. Rather, he must demonstrate that the issues are subject to debate among jurists of reason, that a court could resolve the issues in a different manner, or that the questions presented are worthy of encouragement to proceed further. *See id.* Any doubt regarding whether to grant a certificate of appealability should be resolved in favor of the movant, and “the severity of the penalty may be considered in making this determination.” *See Miller v. Johnson*, 200 F.3d 274, 280–81 (5th Cir. 2000).


In this case, Movant has not shown that any of the issues would be subject to debate among jurists of reason, and the questions presented are not worthy of encouragement to proceed further. Movant has, therefore, failed to make a sufficient showing to merit the issuance of certificate of appealability, and a certificate of appealability will not be issued. Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 9) is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the District Court. It is further

ORDERED that the Motion to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct the Movant's Sentence (Docket No. 1) is **DENIED**. It is further

ORDERED that the above-captioned cause of action is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 22nd day of July, 2025.


ROBERT W. SCHROEDER III
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE